

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS:

Here are applicant's detailed responses to the office action, in order of their appearance in item 2. of the office action:

5 – “Sheet” was changed to “sheet product” to eliminate possible antecedent confusion.

 – “Means plus function” format has been applied consistently throughout the claims.

10 – The phrase “the traverse rod having, at least, one park position, at, at least, one end” has been changed to “the traverse rod having opposite ends, and having at least one park position located at either or both opposite ends.” This change is meant to clarify inventor's intent that there may be more than one park position, and that they may be located at either or both ends of the traverse rod. Examiner's suggestion on this, if followed, would have implied that there could be two park positions at one end, and
15 narrowed slightly the scope of the claim by stating that the park position(s) can only be at one end and not the other. The use of the alternative “or” in the new phraseology was for simplicity's sake and may, if necessary for formal reasons, be regarded as changing this claim to a Markush claim with two options (one park position at either end or two park positions, one at each end).

20

Applicant has received interest in purchase of his patent rights, should he be granted any, as soon as he receives them. He thus respectfully requests that if the above amendments place this application in condition for allowance, a Notice of Allowance be issued as early as practicable.

5

Sincerely,



Jonathan R. Smith

reg. no. 47098

10